

VZCZCXYZ0001  
RR RUEHWEB

DE RUEHSA #0568 0461522  
ZNY CCCCC ZZH  
R 151522Z FEB 07  
FM AMEMBASSY PRETORIA  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 8224  
INFO RUEHAK/AMEMBASSY ANKARA 0157  
RUEHBM/AMEMBASSY BUCHAREST 0062  
RUEHEG/AMEMBASSY CAIRO 0320  
RUEHBY/AMEMBASSY CANBERRA 0491  
RUEHHE/AMEMBASSY HELSINKI 0096  
RUEHNE/AMEMBASSY NEW DELHI 0429  
RUEHNY/AMEMBASSY OSLO 0181  
RUEHOT/AMEMBASSY OTTAWA 0432  
RUEHSM/AMEMBASSY STOCKHOLM 0252  
RUEHKO/AMEMBASSY TOKYO 0471  
RUEHWR/AMEMBASSY WARSAW 0074  
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC

C O N F I D E N T I A L PRETORIA 000568

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR ISN/WMDT T. LOWE AND B. LEWIS

E.O. 12958: DECL: 02/12/2017  
TAGS: [PREL](#) [PARM](#) [PTER](#) [KTIA](#) [SF](#)  
SUBJECT: WMD FOREIGN CONSEQUENCE MANAGEMENT MOU

REF: STATE 12882

Classified By: Political Counselor Raymond L. Brown. Reason 1.4(d).

¶1. (C) Despite South Africa's deep commitment to nonproliferation, we anticipate that the proposed bilateral MOU will be met with "principled" skepticism from the SAG. Pretoria has a strong preference for multilateral structures and instruments, especially in the area of proliferation. Long before our SAG interlocutors will be prepared to discuss the specifics of the draft text, we expect them to raise the following basic questions about the initiative:

-- Why is this initiative necessary? Aren't these concerns already addressed through existing treaties/regimes?

-- If there are gaps in existing arrangements, shouldn't these be handled through a new multilateral agreement?

-- Which countries have you approached? Why those select countries? Isn't this discriminating against other countries in the South (the NAM, the G-77) by creating this hierarchy of capabilities?

¶2. (C) If we can provide good answers to these initial, ideological questions regarding the overall approach, we may be successful in drawing the SAG into an examination of the text.  
BOST